

# CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 PROJECT HISTORY AND OVERVIEW

The Resources Development Group<sup>1</sup> (RDG) was formed in 1997 to facilitate funding of an environmental assessment (EA) that was to be completed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA) for the purpose of developing hydrocarbon resources on federal lands in the Atchees Wash Oil and Gas Production region of the Book Cliffs Resource Management Area near Vernal, Utah, administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (See Map 1-1) (BLM 1999a). The original RDG consortium comprised Rosewood Resources, Inc., White River Resources Management Inc., Security Energy Company, Kidd Family Partnership, and St. Anselm Exploration Company. However, since the beginning of the project in 1997, many of the operators involved in the project have changed due to lease rights acquisition or other circumstances. The current RDG proponents include the following: Rosewood Resources, Inc., Dominion Exploration and Production, Inc., McElvain Oil & Gas Properties, Inc., and Enduring Resources.

The original EA was published in February 1999. A Decision Record (DR)/Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed by the BLM on January 29, 1999. Subsequent to its decision, the BLM received 12 requests for a State Director Review and one request for a stay of the DR/FONSI. A stay was issued until April 16, 1999 and subsequently extended, pending a thorough review of the requests received. Those requesting the review and stay questioned the nature and extent of impacts disclosed in the EA and the validity of the DR/FONSI. On May 21, 1999, the DR/FONSI was vacated and the proposal was remanded to the BLM, Vernal Field Office (VFO) for the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). RDG operators submitted their Proposed Action to the BLM on September 10, 1999, and the Notice of Intent was then published in the *Federal Register* on October 22, 1999 (64 FR 57122).

The proposed project would involve BLM-administered public lands, State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (Utah SITLA) administered lands, and private lands. The lands RDG operators propose to develop (the Project Area) are either wholly or partially contained within townships T11S, R22E; T11S, R23E; T11S, R24E; T12S, R23E; and T12S, R24E. The BLM, as lead federal agency, has determined that the proposed project constitutes a major federal action requiring the development of a programmatic EIS. This document is the final EIS.

The mineral leases within the Project Area have been obtained by RDG operators from the U.S. government and the State of Utah and grant certain rights to explore, develop, and produce the oil and gas resources underlying such leases, grant ingress and egress to such leases, and retain a Royalty Interest on any production accruing to the benefit of the federal government or the State of Utah. RDG operators hold valid federal, state, and private oil and gas leases in the Project Area; these leases grant contractual rights from the U.S., the State of Utah, and the private

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that use of the term "RDG" in this document does not signify or imply a legally recognized entity with the authority to collectively bind the proponents in any way. It is simply a term of convenience that refers to the proponents as a group.

mineral landowners to the RDG operators for the purpose of developing oil and natural gas resources.

## 1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of RDG's Proposed Action is to extract and transport natural gas, at a profit, from the portions of the Project Area leased by its companies.

Natural gas is widely considered essential to supplying the nation's current and future energy needs, especially clean-burning energy. Domestic demand is increasing and is expected to reach 24.8 trillion cubic feet (tcf) per year by 2010 (Gas Research Institute 1993). Increased development of natural gas in an environmentally responsible manner is also necessary to satisfy federal energy policy (DOE 1998). Private exploration and development of federal, domestic oil and gas reserves are integral parts of BLM's oil and gas leasing mandates, under the authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976, and the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.

This EIS addresses the effects of implementing a *level of development* (rather than particular actions of development with particular, definitive results) and *conceptual locations* (rather than definitive locations) for natural gas facilities within the Project Area. For the purposes of this EIS, the wells, roads, pipelines, and ancillary facilities detailed in this EIS must remain hypothetical and conceptual in plan and location. The final location for each component of this project would be determined through consideration of topographical and geological features and site-specific analyses. These analyses would occur when RDG operators file site-specific applications, such as an Application for Permit to Drill (APD) or a BLM SF299 (right-of-way) application. For example, there are 12 APDs that have been submitted within the boundaries of the RDG Project Area.

This EIS provides the basis for analyzing and disclosing impacts anticipated to result from the level of development proposed within the Project Area and identifies approval conditions, Best Management Practices (BMPs) and mitigation measures to be implemented as necessary at as-yet undetermined development locations within the Project Area.

## 1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS PROCESS

The BLM, VFO in Vernal, Utah is the federal agency responsible for preparing this EIS. The Proposed Action was developed in a cooperative effort between RDG operators and BLM.

The BLM is required by NEPA and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) directives to analyze Proposed Actions involving federal lands and leases in terms of their potential impacts on the human environment (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] § 1500-1508). The BLM is also required (by regulations implementing the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920) to review and act on APDs and attached Surface Use Plans of Operations (SUPOs) and to decide on the requirements for surface occupancy provided by the SUPO. BLM also issues ROW grants to construct and operate linear transportation facilities, such as roads and pipelines, across federal lands under Title V of the FLPMA and the Mineral Leasing Act.

In anticipation of potential environmental consequences resulting from the Proposed Action or alternatives, as detailed in the analysis of impacts on the human environment (see Chapter 4), another responsibility of the BLM is to establish reclamation provisions (i.e., a Bond), in the event that an oil/gas operator fails to complete adequate reclamation efforts on facilities and disturbed lands. Bonds are required for oil and gas operations on federal leases to indemnify the government for safe rehabilitation, royalty payments, and civil penalties; bonds are also required for ROWs on federal lands.

This EIS provides the BLM with information upon which to base a final decision regarding the Proposed Action. Scoping issues and concerns raised by the public and concerned agencies drove the development of alternatives and focused the impact analysis process. This EIS documents (1) the analysis of impacts that could result from implementation of the Proposed Action or alternatives and (2) the development of mitigation measures necessary to reduce or eliminate environmental consequences. It does not contain final decisions made regarding the Proposed Action and alternatives.

## **1.4 DECISIONS TO BE MADE AFTER THE EIS PROCESS**

Oil and gas development is, has been, and will likely continue to be a prominent use of the area. The decisions regarding the Proposed Action and alternatives will be documented in the Record of Decision (ROD) signed by the Utah State Director of the BLM. The BLM decision will apply only to public lands and leases. Decisions by state and private jurisdictions to issue or not issue approvals related to this Proposed Action would be made independently, but may be influenced by the disclosure of impacts in this analysis.

The ROD associated with this programmatic EIS would approve only the level and general location of natural gas development for this project. The ROD is neither the final review nor the final approval for all actions associated with this project; each project component involving surface disturbance to federal lands must be analyzed and approved on a site-specific basis by BLM. The level of analysis for each surface-disturbing activity is to be detailed in the APD and/or ROW grant; submission and approval of such applications are required prior to any project construction.

### **1.4.1 APD PROCESS**

The drilling operator can initiate the APD process either by filing an APD or a Notice of Staking (NOS). The APD would include a surface use program and a drilling program.<sup>2</sup> The NOS would consist of an outline of the operator's proposal, including a location map, and a sketched site plan.

The BLM would be responsible for approving a project component's final APD, both the surface use and subsurface drilling programs, with appropriate mitigation measures for resources as necessary, on BLM-administered lands. Prior to approving an APD, the BLM must conduct a

---

<sup>2</sup> The detailed information to be submitted for each APD program is identified in Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 1 and in 43 CFR 3162.3.

site-specific environmental analysis, prepare the documentation, and provide mitigation measures for surface resources on potentially affected BLM lands. The environmental analysis would consist of an on-site inspection of the locations proposed for the well, access road, and pipelines, as well as other areas of proposed surface use.

The purpose of the on-site inspection would be to identify potentially sensitive areas and environmental impacts associated with the programs detailed in the APD and to identify necessary mitigations to those impacts. The on-site inspection could include site-specific surveys for cultural and paleontological resources or threatened and endangered species if the potential for these resources exists on or near the proposed disturbance. The inspection team would include the BLM's Authorized Officer (AO) or designated representative, the drilling and construction contractor or other designated representative of the lessee, and a surveyor. After the on-site inspection, if protection of surface or subsurface resource values near the proposed activity is warranted, the project component's APD may be revised, or mitigation measures (e.g., adjusting the proposed locations of well sites, roads, and pipelines; identifying the construction methods to be employed; or identifying reclamation standards) may be added as Conditions of Approval. The BLM's approval of the drilling program to be implemented on BLM lands would also include assessing plans for protecting groundwater and other subsurface resources.

### ***1.4.2 ROW GRANT***

Operators are required to submit a ROW grant for access to a road or pipeline located on BLM lands yet outside the proposed project's lease or unit. APDs and Sundry Notices are often acceptable as applications for ROW grants for these off-lease facilities if they provide sufficient detail of the entire proposal.

In the case of third-party oil/gas transportation pipelines, organizations or individuals who are not oil/gas lessees yet want to construct, operate, and/or maintain roads, power lines, telephone lines, and/or other facilities within the Project Area are required to apply for a ROW grant pursuant to Title V of the FLPMA or Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended.

After drilling, routine well operations would not require approval. However, the BLM would have approval authority for a variety of related activities. Any changes to an approved APD, certain subsequent well operations,<sup>3</sup> disposal of water produced from federal leases,<sup>4</sup> and all new surface disturbances (e.g., workover pits) would require prior approval. The BLM also would need to approve plugging and abandonment of wells, gas venting, gas flaring, and certain measures for handling production. Other permits, approvals, authorizing actions, and consultations required by federal, state, and local agencies are discussed in Section 1.8.

---

<sup>3</sup> Complete details of subsequent well operations are contained in 43 CFR 3162.3-2.

<sup>4</sup> As outlined in Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 7.

## **1.5 LAND STATUS, LEGAL, AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

### ***1.5.1 LAND STATUS***

The proposed Project Area encompasses approximately 79,914 acres of land. Land ownership within this area is divided among the BLM, the Utah SITLA, and various private entities, including the Ute Tribe. BLM-administered lands account for approximately 70,324 acres of surface and mineral estate lands within the Project Area. Utah SITLA lands account for approximately 8,410 acres of surface and mineral estate lands within the Project Area. The remaining 1,180 acres consist of various privately owned surface and mineral estate lands. RDG operators currently hold leases on federal, state, and private lands within the Project Area. Unleased lands and lands leased by others are also present within the Project Area.

### ***1.5.2 CONFORMANCE WITH FEDERAL MANAGEMENT PLANS***

The Proposed Action and all alternatives described in this EIS would take place within the Book Cliffs Resource Area of the VFO. The Book Cliffs Resource Area is managed under a Resource Management Plan (RMP) approved in 1985. One management objective of the Book Cliffs RMP is to lease oil and gas, tar sands, oil shale, and gilsonite, while protecting or mitigating other resource values (BLM 1984). The Proposed Action and alternatives presented in this EIS are consistent with the management decisions of the Book Cliffs RMP EIS (BLM 1984).

The proposed development of natural gas resources is in conformance with the Book Cliffs RMP. The scale of the proposed development exceeds the scale of development analyzed by the RMP and the 1988 *Environmental Assessment for Oil and Gas Leasing in the Book Cliffs Resource Area*; accordingly this EIS was prepared to analyze a higher level of natural gas development prior to the approval of the permits (BLM 1988a).

### ***1.5.3 CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL PLANS***

The Proposed Action is consistent with the Uintah County General Plan (1996). The plan generally indicates support for development proposals in its emphasis of multiple-use public land management practices and its emphasis of responsible use and optimum utilization of public land resources. As used in the plan, *multiple-use* is defined as including the following historically and traditionally practiced resource uses: grazing, recreation, timber, mining, oil and gas development, agriculture, wildlife habitat, and water resources development. Therefore, as stated in the plan, the county supports the development of natural resources as they become available or as new technology allows.

The State of Utah does not have planning documents for the vicinity of the Proposed Action.

### ***1.5.4 LEASE STIPULATIONS***

Leases on federal mineral estate lands within the Project Area have been granted to RDG operators and others in accordance with the Book Cliffs RMP, with a few lease stipulations:

- The floodplain of Bitter Creek is protected by No Surface Occupancy restrictions within the 100-year floodplain. Approximately 500 acres of this floodplain are within the Project Area.
- Approximately 100 acres of water reserve lands within the Project Area are protected by No Surface Occupancy restrictions.

Several leases in the Project Area were issued prior to the current, 1985 RMP; these leases do not contain the above lease stipulations and notices. Information about RDG operators' leases and their associated stipulations is available for review at BLM, VFO and Utah State Office.

## **1.6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT/SCOPING OF ISSUES**

The BLM has conducted public and internal scoping to solicit input and identification of environmental issues and concerns associated with the Proposed Action. On October 12, 1999, a briefing of the Proposed Action was made to the State of Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee. A Notice of Intent was published in the *Federal Register* on October 22, 1999 (64 FR 57122). The BLM then prepared a scoping information packet and provided copies of it to federal, state, and local agencies, the Ute Tribe, and members of the general public. Announcements of scoping opportunities were made in various local news media. BLM conducted a public scoping and information open house in Vernal, Utah on November 18, 1999.

### **1.6.1 ISSUES**

The environmental issues identified during the scoping process and during the State Director's review of the initial EA or the proposed project are identified below.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

- Identification of unavoidable adverse impacts.
- The Proposed Action's relationship to reasonably foreseeable development/cumulative impacts.
- Cumulative impacts analysis.

#### **LAND USE PLANS**

- Consistency with the BLM Book Cliffs RMP.
- Consistency with county land use planning.

#### **AIR QUALITY**

- Effects of the Proposed Action on regional air quality.
- Effects on atmospheric visibility.
- Effects on Dinosaur National Monument.

**CULTURAL/PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

- Paleontological resource effects.

**LAND USE**

- Effects of project-related traffic on local roads used by the public.
- Need for a transportation plan that would eliminate/minimize duplication of existing roads.

**MINERALS**

- Compatibility with other valid, existing mineral rights and development.

**RECLAMATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

- Definition of impact mitigation measures.
- Identification of pollution prevention measures.
- Identification of reclamation practices.

**RECREATION AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

- Compatibility with Wild and Scenic River status.
- Conflicts with primitive recreation opportunities.
- Conflicts with visual resource management standards.
- Effects on the Goblin City viewshed.
- Effects on White River boating.

**RIPARIAN/WETLAND**

- Effects to riparian and wetland areas.

**SOCIOECONOMICS**

- Conservation of mineral resources.
- Economic benefits of the Proposed Action.

**SOILS**

- Stormwater runoff control.
- Erosion effects on surface waters (increased sedimentation and salt loads).
- Effects of disturbance on rehabilitation potential.

**SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES**

- Effects on special status fish.
- BLM responsibilities regarding Endangered Species Act, Section 7 consultation.

## VEGETATION

- Noxious weed infestation and control.

## WATER RESOURCES

- Effects to surface water quality.
- Effects to groundwater quality.
- Underground injection.
- Stormwater runoff control.
- Erosion effects on surface waters (increased sedimentation and salt loads).
- Hydraulic fracturing.

## WILDLIFE

- Effects on migratory birds.
- Effects on sage grouse.
- Effects on raptors.
- Effects on crucial deer winter range.
- Consequences of habitat fragmentation.

## WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS<sup>5</sup>

- Effects to the White River wilderness inventory area (WIA).
- Effects to Utah Wilderness Coalition's (UWC's) proposed Lower Bitter Creek and White River wilderness units.

### ***1.6.2 ISSUES NOT ANALYZED SEPARATELY***

The following issues were suggested but not included for separate analyses in the EIS.

## HAZARDOUS WASTE

It was recommended that drilling fluids, drill cuttings, produced waters, completion fluids, and other production wastes be considered hazardous wastes and be analyzed as such in the EIS. Many of the wastes associated with drilling and production of oil and gas are exempt from regulation as hazardous (40 CFR § 261). However, analysis of impacts from various wastes associated with gas drilling and production is included in this document.

---

<sup>5</sup> On April 14, 2003, the U.S. District Court for the Central District of Utah approved an agreement negotiated to settle a lawsuit originally filed in 1996 by the Utah SITLA and the Utah Association of Counties, challenging the BLM's authority to conduct new wilderness inventories. In the settlement, the Department of the Interior (DOI) acknowledged that it lacks the authority to designate new Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) but does have the authority to conduct wilderness inventories and consider wilderness characteristics in its land use planning processes. Thus, because this Proposed Action involves land use planning, the effects of the alternatives upon the wilderness characteristics of the White River WIA and the potential wilderness characteristics of the UWC's proposed White River and Lower Bitter Creek wilderness units will be disclosed in this EIS.



## HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

Effects of hydraulic fracturing are included with water resources issues.

### ***1.6.3 STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS***

To enhance information obtained through public and internal scoping, stakeholder meetings were conducted with various agencies and groups. On January 18, 2000, letters announcing the meetings were sent to:

- Uintah County Commissioners
- Duchesne County Commissioners
- Uinta Basin Association of Governments
- Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee
- Utah State Division of History
- Utah SITLA
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR)
- Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ, Divisions of Air Quality and Water Quality [UDEQ/DAQ and UDEQ/DWQ])
- Utah Division of Oil Gas and Mining
- U.S. National Park Service (NPS)
- U.S. Forest Service (USFS)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)
- The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
- People for USA
- Blue Ribbon Coalition
- Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
- Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife
- Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA)
- Uintah Mountain Club
- Utah Petroleum Association
- Utah Wildlife Federation
- Utah Rivers Council
- Coastal Oil and Gas Corp.

- White River Resource Management, Inc.
- Rosewood Resources
- Texacoma Oil and Gas Resources
- Phoenix Energy Inc.
- Lone Mountain Production Co.
- The Northern Ute Tribe

The meetings were conducted on February 14-17, 2000. Participants included:

- The Uintah County Public Lands Committee
- Utah County Commissioners
- State Historic Preservation Office
- Utah Division of Oil Gas and Mining
- Utah SITLA
- UDWR
- EPA
- People for USA
- Public Lands Advocacy Group
- Coastal Oil and Gas Corp.
- White River Resource Management, Inc.
- Lone Mountain Production Co.
- Phoenix Energy, Inc.
- Rosewood Resources

No additional issues were identified during the meetings. However, information and input on and clarification of issues were made and have been applied toward preparation of this EIS. Although SUWA did not attend the meetings, they provided additional scoping comments and suggestions.

During the stakeholder meetings, a field tour of the Project Area was proposed, with the goal of familiarizing the stakeholders with the area. All previously identified stakeholders were invited. The tour of the Project Area was conducted on May 9, 2000, at which time issues and alternatives were discussed further. No new issues were brought forward.

## **1.7 CRITICAL ELEMENTS ANALYSIS**

The BLM requires that potential impacts be addressed for the following critical elements during the NEPA process (BLM 1988b):

- Water Quality
- Floodplains

- Wetlands/Riparian Zones
- Air Quality
- Farmlands, Prime/Unique
- Rangeland Standards
- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Cultural Resources
- Paleontological Resources
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)
- Wild and Scenic Rivers
- Wilderness Areas/WSAs
- Native American Religious Concerns
- Native American Trust Resources
- Hazardous Materials/Waste
- Environmental Justice

Of the 16 critical elements, ACECs, prime or unique farmlands, designated wilderness, WSAs, and wild and scenic rivers do not occur within the Project Area. Also, there are no interests or properties in the Project Area held in trust for Tribes by the U.S. government. Environmental Justice and Native American Religious Concerns were not identified during scoping and consultation with tribes as elements for analysis in this EIS. During scoping for this EIS, the Uintah and Ouray Tribe of Fort Duchesne, Utah, was contacted. The Tribe requested to be placed on the EIS mailing list for receipt of mailings and the draft EIS. No additional interest was expressed.

A separate Rangeland Health analysis has not been prepared, as the soils, riparian/wetlands, special status species, and water resource conditions are addressed in their respective sections of Chapters 3, 4, and 5 of the EIS.

## **1.8 AUTHORIZING ACTIONS**

Federal, state, county, and local regulatory actions required to implement any of the alternatives would generally be the same for any alternative selected. The regulatory actions, as listed in Table 1-1, represent most of the regulatory actions required for the RDG project, but the list is not necessarily comprehensive.

**Table 1-1. Regulatory Compliance and Mandates for RDG Project Components**

<b>Agency/Regulatory Authority</b>	<b>Nature of Regulatory Action</b>	<b>Applicable Project Component</b>
<b>USDI - Bureau of Land Management (BLM)</b>		
National Noxious Weed Act Compliance	Control of noxious weeds	Any occurrence of noxious weeds on and near project facilities
Material Sales	Sales of sand, gravel, and riprap	Construction activities
<b>USDI - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)</b>		
Endangered Species Act Compliance (Section 7)	Protection of threatened and endangered species	Any activity potentially affecting listed or proposed threatened or endangered species
Migratory Bird Treaty Act	Protection of migratory birds	All ground-disturbing activities
Bald Eagle Protection Act	Protection of bald and golden eagles	All ground-disturbing activities
<b>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)</b>		
Cultural Resource Compliance (Section 106)	Protection of cultural and historic resources; coordinated with the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)	All ground-disturbing activities
<b>Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ)</b>		
Fugitive Dust Control	Control of fugitive dust emissions	Construction of facilities and vehicle traffic
<b>State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA)</b>		
Compliance with Rules	Compliance with applicable general and program rules	Construction of facilities on SITLA lands
<b>Utah Division of State History, Preservation Section (SHPO)</b>		
Section 106 Cultural Resources Consultation	Determining significance of cultural resources potentially affected by surface-disturbing activities	All surface-disturbing activities
<b>Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining</b>		
Safety Regulations for Oil and Gas Activities	Regulation of oil and gas activities to protect public safety	All Proposed Action and alternative components
<b>Uintah County</b>		
Solid Waste Ordinance	Regulation of disposal of wastes in the county	Construction and operational waste
Noxious Weed Act Compliance	Control of listed noxious weeds	Any occurrence of noxious weeds on and near project facilities

**Table 1-2. Major Permit Approvals and Authorizing Actions That May be Required for the RDG Project**

Permit Approval Name/Issuing Agency	Nature of Permit Action	Applicable Project Component
<b>USDI - Bureau of Land Management (BLM)</b>		
Permit to Drill, Deepen, or Plug Back (APD) and Sundry Notice; Plugging and Abandonment; Venting; or Flaring	Control of drilling and production for oil and gas on federal onshore leases	Wells and production facilities
ROW Grant and Temporary Use Permit	ROW grant on BLM-managed lands	Oil and gas pipelines, roads, facilities, etc., on BLM-managed lands
Cultural Resource Use Permit	Archaeological surveys and limited testing on public lands; archaeological data recovery (excavation) of sites on public lands	All surface-disturbing activities
Paleontological Resource Use Permit	Survey and limited surface collection during site fieldwork on public lands	Surface-disturbing activities
Pesticide Use Permit	Control of pests	Wells, roads, and ancillary facilities
National Noxious Weed Act Compliance	Control of noxious weeds	Any occurrence of noxious weeds on or near project facilities
<b>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</b>		
Title V, Part 71 Operating Air Quality Permit	Ensure that source operators, regulators, and the public know which air pollution control requirements apply to each facility; Part 71 permits are issued after a source has been constructed and has begun operating	Post-construction facilities
Class II Underground Injection Control Permit	Under the Safe Drinking Water Act, regulation of the injection of "fluid" into the subsurface	Disposal of deep wastewater produced in conjunction with gas production
<b>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)</b>		
Permit to Discharge Dredged or Fill Material (Section 404 Permit)	Authorization of placement of fill or dredged material in waters of the U.S. or adjacent wetlands	All surface-disturbing activities affecting waters of the U.S. or wetlands, such as roads and pipeline crossings (waters of the U.S. include streams, lakes, playas, wetlands, and other identified aquatic resources)

**Table 1-2. Major Permit Approvals and Authorizing Actions That May be Required for the RDG Project**

Permit Approval Name/Issuing Agency	Nature of Permit Action	Applicable Project Component
<b>Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)</b>		
Transport Permit	Authorization of oversize, overlength, and overweight loads	Transportation of equipment and materials on state highways
<b>Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ)</b>		
Utah Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (UPDES) Permit	Authorization of discharge of pollutants to surface waters of the state	Any point-source surface discharge
UPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges	Control of discharge of stormwater pollutants associated with industrial and construction activities	Construction activities disturbing more than five acres of land; gas production facilities that have had a discharge of a reportable quantity
<b>Utah Division of Water Rights (UDWRi)</b>		
Change in Nature of Use Application	Authorization of change of use on water rights	Non-consumptive and consumptive water uses
Stream Alteration Permit	Approval of construction plans	Perennial stream crossings
<b>Utah Division of State History, Antiquities Section</b>		
Antiquities Annual Permit: Blanket Permit to Conduct Archaeological Investigations	Regulation of all archaeological investigations on state and private lands	All surface-disturbing activities on state and private lands
Antiquities Projects Permit (Excavation)	Regulation of all archaeological excavations on state and private lands	All surface-disturbing activities on state and private lands
<b>Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining</b>		
Permit to Drill, Deepen, or Re-enter and Operate an Oil and Gas or Disposal Well	Approval of drilling on all lands within the state	Wells (production and disposal)
Underground Injection Control Permit	Regulation of underground disposal wells	Underground disposal wells
Disposal Facility Permit	Disposal of waste	Waste and disposal facilities
Permit to Flare Gas	Regulation of flaring up to 30 days of testing or 50 MMcf, whichever is less	Flaring of gas wells
<b>Uintah County</b>		
Conditional Use Permit	Authorization of extraction and processing on private lands	Any project activities in residential or critical environment zones

**Table 1-2. Major Permit Approvals and Authorizing Actions That May be Required for the RDG Project**

<b>Permit Approval Name/Issuing Agency</b>	<b>Nature of Permit Action</b>	<b>Applicable Project Component</b>
Road Use Permit	Authorization of oversize, overweight, or overlength loads on county roads	Transportation of equipment and materials on county roads
Road Opening Permit	Authorization of pipeline crossings, routing of pipelines parallel to county roads, and tying a project access road into a county road	Pipelines or project roads that cross or intersect with a county road
Road ROW Encroachment Permit	Authorization of construction, maintenance, repair, operation, or use of any pole line, surface, or subsurface line in the ROW on affected county roads	Construction or other activities that may tie into county roads
Building Permit	Control of construction of all structures in the county	Construction of all buildings in Uintah County

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**